

REMARKS

The Official Action dated October 28, 2008, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1,3-5,8-13, 18, 29, 31-39 and 41-69. Applicant requests that the examiner reconsider the rejection of the claims in light of the amendments to the claims and the following discussion.

With respect to claims 42, 45, 48 and 65, the Examiner has argued that the broadest interpretation of the word "selectively" is taught by Gendreau because Gendreau selects the pieces of mail that come down the conveyor belt. Such an interpretation is unreasonable, and eviscerates any meaning for the term selectively. Nonetheless, to clarify the distinction between Applicants' system and the Gendreau system, claims 42, 45, 48 and 65 have been further amended. As previously discussed, and recognized by the Examiner, the Gendreau system is configured to process each package according to the same procedure. Conversely, claims 42, 45, 48 and 65 have been amended to reflect that some of the mail pieces are processed differently from other pieces. Accordingly, Gendreau does not teach or suggest the features of claims 42, 45, 48 and 65, along with the claims that depend from these claims. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 42, 45, 48, 65 and the claims that depend therefrom.

With regard to independent claims 1, 13 and 31, neither Gendreau nor Edmonds teach or suggest a verifier that verifies postage information that is printed onto a label that is applied to a piece of mail. The Examiner recognizes that Gendreau does not teach or suggest a verifier, but argues that Edmonds suggest such a feature since Edmonds attempts to use OCR to read an address, and rejects a piece if it cannot read the address. However, this is not a verifier, and it does not verify the postage information that is applied to a piece by the system. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 1, 13, 31 and the claims that depend from these claims.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant believes that this application is in form for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney if the Examiner believes that issues remain regarding the allowability of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN
A Professional Corporation
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By Stephen Eland/
PTO Registration No. 41,010

Telephone: (215) 563-4100
Facsimile: (215) 563-4044